

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY
AUGUST 7, 2000

Views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision unless so designated by other official documentation.

August 2000

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

**LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY
AUGUST 7, 2000**

by

Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.
6352 South U.S. Highway 51
P.O. Box 1316
Carbondale, IL 62903
(618) 549-2832

A Report Submitted to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Institute for Water Resources
7701 Telegraph Road
Alexandria, VA 22315-3868

under

Task Order #25
Contract No. DACW72-99-D-0005

August 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Regional Listening Sessions Meeting Notes – Louisville, Kentucky.....	1
Welcoming Remarks.....	1
Session Objectives	2
Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1 st Group Discussion)	4
Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2 nd Group Discussion)	8
Challenge combination E, J, K, and CC – Navigation Infrastructure	9
Challenge combination G, D – Water Supply	10
Challenge combination L, R, HH – Water Quality.....	11
Challenge combination H, M – Multi-agency Coordination of Floodplain.....	11
Challenge I – Adequate Funding	12
Challenge EE – Sedimentation	12
Challenge B – Healthy Ecosystems	13
Closing Remarks and Adjournment	13
Appendix A Transcription of Comments Regarding Identified Challenges	A-1
Appendix B Submitted Public Statements and Materials	B-1

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the Listening Session in Louisville, Kentucky on August 7, 2000. The notes highlight and summarize the key topics and issues that were discussed at the meeting. Selected attachments are provided in this document.

Water plays a major role in how we live and work. As steward of America's water resources for more than 200 years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has begun a dialogue with the American public, stakeholders, customers, and government agencies at all levels about the water resources challenges that lie ahead. The Corps is conducting 14 regional public listening sessions throughout the United States between June and November of 2000 to provide citizens the opportunity to voice concerns about pressing water resources problems, opportunities, and needs impacting their lives, communities, and future sustainability. This dialogue is an integral part of the Corps' strategic planning process.

The cities where listening sessions are being conducted include St. Louis, MO, Sacramento, CA, Phoenix, AZ, Woburn, MA, Atlanta, GA, Omaha, NE, Honolulu, HI, Chicago, IL, Louisville, KY, Dallas, TX, Williamsburg, VA, New Brunswick, NJ, Anchorage, AK, and Vancouver, WA.

This report summarizes the Louisville, Kentucky, listening session. This session, hosted by the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division, was conducted on August 7, 2000 at the Holiday Inn Downtown in Louisville. Approximately 120 people attended this meeting to share their views with the Corps.

The information collected from the listening sessions will be incorporated into a report assessing future national water resources needs and the gaps that must be closed to meet these needs. This report will be shared with key decision-makers within the Army and Congress to help inform their discussions about water resources issues and future investment decisions. Additionally, the report will provide a point of departure for ensuing discussions with other Federal agencies to identify common water resources issues and missions most appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the Federal government. The information will also be incorporated into a revision of the Civil Works Program Strategic Plan.

Welcoming Remarks

Brigadier General Robert Griffin, USACE Great Lakes and Ohio River Division (LRD) Commander, welcomed the audience to the meeting. He was impressed by the number of participants that were present and acknowledged that this was the largest group the Corps has seen in the listening session conducted thus far. General Griffin went on to say that the objective of the session was to assist the Corps in understanding the water resource needs of the Nation.

General Griffin indicated that the Corps had developed six national water resource challenges that they felt were of concern, but realized that other challenges exist. General Griffin reminded the group that the six challenges were only a start and could be discussed or discarded however the group saw fit. The banners depicting the challenges were not available, so written copies were provided to the participants for review. The General continued by stating the Corps was not attempting to “grow” the program. He repeated this in order for the participants to understand the intent of the Corps and stressed that the session was not a response to the recent publicity. General Griffin assured the participants that the sessions were scheduled months before the publicity began and were developed to gain public input on the water resource challenges facing the Nation. He then explained to the participants that the Corps members present for the session were strictly there to listen to the comments of the participants, not to debate or disagree. The General said that if any Corps members caused a problem with the session that they would be asked to leave. He explained that the Corps was conducting the sessions in order to listen to the wants and needs of the participants and then to use the information to develop a national assessment.

General Griffin closed by noting that all of the information gathered during the session would be compiled in a report, which would be provided to all registered participants and posted on the Corps’ “national challenges” website at <http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges> for others to review. Once all the sessions were complete, a national water resource challenge report would be developed for decision-makers of the Nation to determine the needs of the future. He reiterated that public involvement in the decision-making process comes from sessions such as this. General Griffin admitted he was overwhelmed by the number of participants at the session and was anxious to hear what they had to say.

General Griffin then introduced Mr. Jim Creighton as the session facilitator representing the contractor, Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd. Lastly, General Griffin thanked everyone for participating and turned the floor over to Jim Creighton.

Session Objectives

Mr. Creighton, began by introducing Mark Gmitro and the session recorder. He then explained the format of the workshop and his role as a professional facilitator. He stressed that the session was not a public hearing and that if anyone brought public statements, to please provide them to the session recorder for inclusion into the report. Also, Mr. Creighton noted that if a participant wanted to provide a written statement but did not bring one to the workshop, it would be possible to send such a statement as an e-mail attachment to the above-referenced Corps website. Mr. Creighton also explained that the purpose of these listening sessions was not to discuss specific Corps projects, and that if an audience member had concerns about a particular project, they were to speak with Ms. Suzanne Fournier, Public Affairs Officer (PAO) from the Corps, who was present at the workshop.¹ He continued by saying that it was his responsibility to allow every participant to speak during the session and that “you can’t say you were at a meeting unless you spoke.” Mr. Creighton explained that the listening sessions were

¹The public statements collected in conjunction with this listening session are included as Appendix B.

designed to get input from everyone. He explained that the goal of the meeting was to obtain the answers to the following four questions:

1. What are the key water resources challenges facing this region?
2. Why is it a problem, and what will be the impact?
3. What actions should be taken to respond to the challenge?
4. Who should take these actions? What should the Federal government do to address the problem?

Mr. Creighton added if persons with the same agenda were seated together to spread out in order to educate other participants on their areas of expertise. He then briefly outlined the proposed agenda of the current workshop for the audience. Although the agenda was intended to serve as a general guide to the day's activities, the agenda could be modified at the facilitator's discretion as appropriate for the particular audience. The agenda was presented as follows:

10:00-10:25 (A.M.)	Welcome
10:25-10:45	Overview of Workshop
10:45-11:40	Table Discussions
11:40-12:25 (P.M.)	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
12:25-12:30	Dot Voting
12:30-1:30	Lunch
1:30-2:10	First Small Group Answer Session
2:10-2:45	Second Small Group Answer Session
2:45-3:00	Break
3:00-3:45	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
3:45-4:00	Closing Remarks
4:00-5:00	Informal Discussions

The first task assigned to the audience was to name a group spokesperson for each table. That person would be designated to report on behalf of the entire table. Mr. Creighton went on to explain that at least one member of the Corps would be sitting at each table to listen to the discussions and assist the group if asked, but that they had been instructed not to serve as the spokesperson for the table.

Once the spokespersons had been chosen, two directions would be presented to the audience for them to discuss in small groups at the tables. The first direction would be to identify the water challenges that people at the table thought were important; the second direction would be to discuss why they were important. The spokesperson for each table was also instructed to create a crisp and concise six or seven word statement of each challenge as identified by the group, as well as develop a brief analysis as to why it was considered a challenge. As each spokesperson reported on the challenges generated at their table, a Corps staff member would capture a concise statement of each challenge and project it onto a screen for all to view. Another Corps member would write out the same statement on butcher pad paper and post it for prioritizing the challenges. Once all challenges were determined, the participants would be given five red self-adhesive dots. The dots would be used to vote on the challenges each participant felt were the most important. The reason for the voting scheme was to identify

the most important challenges so they could be addressed during the afternoon portion of the session. The other challenges would be analyzed and discussed in the summary report, but because of time constraints, not all expressed challenges could be discussed in the session. He explained to everyone the use of the self-adhesive challenge “stickies,” and that they could be used for listing additional comments on an individual basis, by posting them on the challenges (butcher pads) taped up around the room.

A participant asked Jim if a proper representation of the public were present. She informed him that she was concerned about the lack of environmental participants. In response, Mr. Creighton asked participants with environmental concerns to raise their hands. Approximately 30-35 persons responded. Again, Mr. Creighton recommended people with the same agenda sit at different tables so to voice their views to participants unfamiliar with the information they wanted to share. Most of the day’s activities would involve working in small groups in order to achieve the maximum interaction among the participants. Following these instructions, the participants were then asked to introduce themselves to the other participants at their table, assign a spokesperson for the table group, independently write down the challenges each felt the Nation faced, and then go around the table group and discuss the challenges.

Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1st Group Discussion)

The participants were grouped into seventeen tables of approximately five to eight people per table. Each table discussed water resources challenges for approximately one hour. During this portion, General Griffin went from table to table to hear the various levels of discussion from all the participants. Mr. Creighton asked the groups to develop a list of challenges, based on the discussion at the table, and reiterated the session format for participants that arrived after the introduction. Mr. Creighton went around the room and asked the spokesperson from each table to give a concise statement of the challenge or challenges identified by the participants at the table. While one member of the Corps staff projected onto a screen each challenge as it was identified, other Corps staff wrote each challenge on a separate piece of butcher paper, each of which were then affixed to a wall of the conference room. The workshop participants identified fifty-five separate challenges:

- A. Water table maintenance at older dams.
- B. Healthy aquatic ecosystems – restoration and multiple purposes.
- C. Waterway users conflict with commercial and recreational use.
- D. Adequate and dependable water supply.
- E. Navigation – locks and dams are deteriorating and time to study and construct is unbearable.

- F. National aging infrastructure – smaller projects cannot compete with larger ones – trust funds not sufficient.
- G. Change in Corps mission statement to include water supply.
- H. How to implement flood control projects – process that results in consensus.
- I. Funding for inland waterway projects – projects should be funded at full capability so that benefits are not lost.
- J. Construction delays as a result of inadequate funding.
- K. Failing infrastructure with no funds to replace any failed infrastructure.
- L. Water quality enforcement – need overarching national and mission statement for the Corps.
- M. Make sure that there is good coordination with all agencies and municipalities.
- N. Coordinated national policy on water issues that gives equal emphasis to environmental values.
- O. Process for smaller communities to accomplish smart growth.
- P. Funding for flood control projects – need full funding and more flexibility for how local sponsors meet their share.
- Q. Challenge 21.
- R. Maintenance and protection of green spaces along the inland waterway to improve water quality.
- S. Develop a recreational users education and licensing program regarding rules of the waterway.
- T. Lack of clear consistency for recreation and waterfront projects that results in inconsistencies between projects.
- U. Lack of emergency response on waterways – do not have resources.
- V. Accuracy or inaccuracy of river stage reporting – problem for flood forecasting and levy operators.
- W. Navigation approaches to dam are dangerous and time to get through locks are excessive (industry concern).
- X. Need for guidance and assistance for incorporating design features that are environmentally sensitive – process to gain local support for designs.

- Y. Enhanced water based recreational opportunities; better access to Corps facilities; enhanced fishing opportunities.
- Z. Improved maintenance and stability schedule for navigation infrastructure.
- AA. Catastrophic failure of navigation infrastructure.
- BB. Development of Ohio River as an economic resource.
- CC. Improvement of navigation infrastructure – coordinate with other federal agencies – develop a maritime navigation policy to assess demands on waterways by intermodal transportation and determine how to partner with other entities.
- DD. Recognition of contribution that waterborne commerce makes to minimizing environmental impacts.
- EE. How to control sedimentation on rivers – to reestablish streams that are no longer navigable.
- FF. Predominance of commercial and industrial perspective in the permitting program which is in conflict with community and environmental values.
- GG. Leadership at Corps - political support for budget.
- HH. Water quality – wetland protection and restoration and aquifer depletion and groundwater contamination.
- II. Watershed habitat restoration process needs to be user friendly.
- JJ. Economic costs and benefits – includes fish and wildlife benefits and recreation benefits.
- KK. Need to maintain navigation charts.
- LL. Post flood recovery assistance so that people can work through regulatory process.
- MM. Assure that we can operate and maintain existing facilities before we build new ones.
- NN. Industry needs to get more politically active.
- OO. Fundamental problem with publicity of what we do good and how money is saved.
- PP. Need for enforcement resources to support program.
- QQ. Need for additional guidance and clarity on criteria – good explanation of jurisdictions.
- RR. Development of information system for basin wide planning.
- SS. Fix loophole in 404 permitting authorities.

- TT. How to achieve motivation in government to act to address water issues.
- UU. Need for coordinated program on acquisition of high-risk flood plain properties.
- VV. Distribution and allocation of water resources among various sectors of economy.
- WW. The pollution of water resources and how to address source pollution and non-point pollution.
- XX. Need to address policy, politics, and operations considerations while addressing any water resource issue.
- YY. Corps to continue supporting clean water act – do not change definition of dredge fill to include mining.
- ZZ. Restore river and stream riparian corridors – focus on corridors and not watershed.
- AAA. Lack of development control.
- BBB. Response to the fact that 80% of all bacteria born disease is transmitted by water.
- CCC. In this time of economic prosperity we are not spending money (local, state, federal) to repair, maintain, and improve infrastructure – if not now when?

After the last challenge was identified, Mr. Creighton advised the audience to fill out the “stickies” for any challenge of personal interest and stick it on the appropriate banner for that challenge. A transcription of the comments written on the “stickies” is provided in Appendix A.²

Mr. Creighton then explained to the group that each challenge identified by the audience was important to the Corps and would be included in the meeting report. However, due to time constraints, only seven challenges would be addressed in detail during the second portion of the session.

Next, all of the participants were asked to vote on all of the challenges using adhesive dots in order to identify which challenges were of most concern to the group in general. Sheets of adhesive dots were placed on each table. Each non-Corps workshop participant then took five dots and affixed them beside the challenge or challenges of most interest to him or her. The five dots could be distributed in any way the individual saw fit, such as one dot per challenge or all five dots on a single challenge. The number of dots for each challenge was then tallied and the totals written on each challenge sheet. The dots beside each lettered challenge were distributed as follows:

² The authors of this report made every effort to accurately transcribe the handwritten comments from the “stickies” generated by the listening session participants; however, some comments may contain errors due to illegibility or incoherence of the original text.

A	3	S	10	KK	5
B	16	T	12	LL	4
C	16	U	5	MM	3
D	31	V	2	NN	2
E	31	W	4	OO	2
F	10	X	1	PP	2
G	37	Y	11	QQ	0
H	16	Z	3	RR	4
I	30	AA	2	SS	1
J	17	BB	0	TT	0
K	21	CC	10	UU	4
L	11	DD	3	VV	6
M	15	EE	19	WW	4
N	14	FF	7	XX	0
O	8	GG	6	YY	1
P	13	HH	13	ZZ	0
Q	0	II	8	AAA	1
R	18	JJ	5	BBB	0

During the lunch period, Mr. Creighton examined some similar challenges and combined them into single challenge topics. Once the group reconvened, Mr. Creighton discussed each combination and asked the participants if they objected his reasoning. No one disapproved of the combinations, but some participants requested additional challenges be added. With that in mind, the following challenges were grouped as follows:

- E, J, K, and CC
- G and D
- L, R, and HH
- M and H

Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2nd Group Discussion)

After the combining of challenges, the seven challenges (or challenge combinations) with the most dots were selected for additional discussion. The seven challenges most favored by the audience were:

E, J, K, CC	(79 votes)
G, D	(68)
L, R, HH	(42)
M, H	(31)
I	(30)
EE	(19)
B	(16)

Mr. Creighton explained the format for the remainder of the afternoon.³ The seven main challenges were written on butcher pads positioned around the room (one challenge/combination per butcher pad). A one-hour discussion period would be designated to allow for the challenges to be examined and for solutions to be developed. The participants would have the opportunity to discuss in detail one of the challenges that interested them by sitting at the table next to the appropriate butcher pad. In the event they wanted to participate in a different challenge discussion, they were free to switch from one challenge to another during the discussion period. The facilitator asked for one volunteer to remain next to each butcher pad throughout the discussion and serve as the moderator and spokesperson for that discussion. This person would record the participant's ideas and suggestions for that challenge on the butcher pad.

Before commencing, some questions were posed to the group, and the participants were asked to develop the answers to these questions during their discussions. The answers would then be reported out to the entire audience at the end of the second discussion session. The questions were:

Assume you have the authority to implement the changes you would like to see. Discuss within your group:

- a. What actions would you take?
- b. Who should do it?
 - i. Role of the federal government
 - ii. Role of the State or local governments
 - iii. Role of private individuals or organizations

Audience members then gravitated into groups around several of the butcher pads (one challenge/combination per butcher pad) and began deliberating with others in their group. A volunteer notetaker at each group took notes on the butcher pads for each of the seven chosen challenges. The discussion session went from approximately 2:15 PM to 3:15 PM. At the end of the discussion, Mr. Creighton asked the spokesperson for each challenge to restate the challenge, provide a summary of the discussion and the answers to the questions. The results of the discussions on the challenges are provided below⁴:

Challenge combination E, J, K, and CC – Navigation Infrastructure

What Action Should be Taken?

- Need condition index that includes downtime tracking, factor for determining the life of a structure, prioritization of lock extensions, and replacement requirements for small tonnage locks.
- Measure deterioration by establishing a point system and applying cost-benefit ratios.
- Prioritize areas to reduce the risk of using facilities.

³ Approximately 75 - 80 non-Corps participants were counted after the lunch break.

⁴ The challenges are listed in the order of priority from the dot voting in the first group discussion, rather than in actual order of presentation.

- Reduce time it takes to conduct preconstruction studies (time to study and construct is unbearable).
 - Have adequate funding for the project.
 - Create public awareness.
 - Address environmental impacts.
 - Provide automatic funding in order to complete a project in a timely manner and meet an optimum schedule.
 - Improve funding process.
 - Have 6-year authorization versus 2-year.
- Obtain funding from Congress to eliminate backlog maintenance over a designated period and fully fund O & M to prevent backlog.
- Fully fund capital projects to match Inland Water Way Universal Trust Fund (IWWUTF).
- Develop national leadership to maintain infrastructure (similar to highway management).
- Educate leadership on the value of the inland waterways, port economics, and national defense.
- Need to develop innovative financing that includes multi-state coordination and partnering with other Federal agencies.
- Improve intermodal transportation infrastructure so that the various modes (e.g. barges, rail, trucking, ferries, and air) complement each other.

Who Should Take Action?

- Mostly Federal support/implementation.
- Some State and local support.

Challenge combination G, D – Water Supply

What Action Should be Taken?

- Adopt mission and enact a general law which gives the Corps general (not project specific) universal authority to address water supply issues.
- Acknowledge that water supply is a regional issue, which requires partnering with Federal government, State, and local authorities.
- Adequate federal funding – 75% Federal/25% local.
- Build additional lakes.
- Provide assurances for Federal assistance.
- Capitalization of major projects and in major reconstruction.
- Have Corps (water supply authority) analogous with flood damage reduction program.
- Assess needs.
- Coordinate efforts among all interests.
- Prioritize needs in cooperation with state and local interests.
- Fund new construction and maintenance of existing facilities.
- Establish consistent level of local participation.
- Establish specific project criteria.
- Develop annual report on water supply needs to Congress.

- Implement general appropriations for water supply projects (money goes to whoever is prepared).
- Local entities provide local share.
- Local entities ask for assistance.
- Local entities participate in planning process.
- Local entities facilitate some level of consensus.
- Establish regional cost sharing.
- Participate in preconstruction engineering and design.
- Provide ownership and maintenance.
- Serve as clearinghouse for projects.

Who Should Take Action?

- Mostly Federal action and assistance.
- Some state and local involvement.

Challenge combination L, R, HH – Water Quality

What Action Should be Taken?

- Values, including water quality and environmental issues need to be equally valued (in regulatory decisions and other Corps projects).
 - Corps primary perspective is to protect navigational interests.
- The Corps stewardship of rivers should be the stewardship of a diversity of uses, not one primary value.
- Develop a consensus vision, including a variety of perspectives (including industrial, environmental (H₂O quality), construction, and citizens).
- Review mission statement of Corps and review criteria for decision making.
- Change values of Corps to reflect the need for more balance.
- Action needs to be taken at a very high level.
- Review and reediting of values, mission, and criteria should be in practical terms along with spiritual terms (wildlife/aquatic habitat destroyed by channelization, dam construction, and wetland destruction).

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal (Secretary of Army) and State.
- Recreational and Commercial Industry.
- Leaders and citizen activists/environmentalists

Challenge combination H, M – Multi-agency Coordination of Floodplain

What Action Should be Taken?

- Expand Corps authority beyond flood control and navigation to include water quality.

- “Bottom-up” multi-agency coordination where Corps participates as a player.
- Create local flood study groups that apply education, local plans, political impetus and pre-flood alternative analyses.
- Educate community on political support process; develop watershed council.
- Look at cost/benefit ratios.
- Create one-stop shopping for regulatory requirements (using intragovernmental agency).
- Standardize floodplain management plans/guidelines.
- Standardize to watershed (even across political boundaries).
- Need Federal legislation to provide impetus.
- Develop program with many players and create clear, consistent goals.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal and State government
- Local entities.
- Non-governmental Organizations.

Challenge I – Adequate Funding

What Action Should be Taken?

- Stop loss of benefits due to lack of funding.
- Assess needs to determine backlog.
- Need a coalition that includes persons from industry, construction, engineering, agriculture, environmental groups, recreational groups, navigation, flood control and other transportation users.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal agencies
- Non-governmental Organizations.
- Private Industry.

Challenge EE – Sedimentation

What Action Should be Taken?

- Need to develop methods to minimize sediment build-up in waterways.
- Develop more effective methods to remove sediment currently in waterways.
- Need better sediment management.
- Federal government needs to be more involved.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal agencies.
- Assistance from State and local levels.

Challenge B – Healthy Ecosystems

What Action Should be Taken?

- Fish and wildlife coordination with full compliance.
- Look for opportunities to facilitate cooperation/coordination (among various user groups).
- Build better baseline database – inventory (system wide).
- Have more direct dialogue among stakeholders in resource use.
- Insure compliance with NEPA
- Assess accumulative effects from Corps activities.
- Implement more aggressive enforcement of regulatory requirements.
- Eliminate double standard within Corps (i.e. Corps implemented projects vs. other permitted projects).
- Develop more advanced coordination and planning that includes earlier discussions with resource agencies.
- Use Corps regulatory program to advance species protection (i.e. species banking).
- Consider a broader range of restoration alternatives.
- Compile a Corps-wide inventory of restoration techniques.
- Develop consistency among Corps districts and divisions in restoration applications and regulatory actions.
- Implement a National Recreation Fishing Action Plan as per executive order #12962.
- Create more favorable cost share arrangements for implementation (change policy).
- Increase funding for restoration initiatives.
- Increase support for watershed habitat restoration programs.
- Operate flood control projects to enhance aquatic ecosystems.

Who Should Take Action?

- Mainly the Corps and other Federal agencies.
- Various stakeholders.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

As a final order of business, Mr. Creighton reminded the participants to register if they were interested in receiving a copy of the report or said they could view it on the Corps website. Additionally, he asked the participants to fill out comment sheets if they had not already done so and leave them with the Corps staff.⁵ Lastly, he reminded the participants to write down any additional remarks or challenges on the stickies and to post them before departing.

In closing, General Griffin thanked everyone and expressed appreciation for the high level of participation. He explained that many policy makers were being shuffled around during

⁵ In order to obtain feedback for internal use by the Corps on the effectiveness of the listening sessions, Corps personnel placed comment forms on each table for the participants to complete. These were collected by the Corps personnel as the participants left the meeting.

this election year and that forums such as this were representative of a democracy in action, and that “This is the American way.” He observed that the Corps participants did a good job sitting and listening to the issues and concerns of the other participants. He observed some participants defending some of the recent actions by the Corps, but wanted everyone to know that there is not a right and wrong answer, and that everyone with an opinion is right in some way. The General stressed that the session was important in determining the challenges the Nation faces in the 21st century. He said the discussion was important both locally and nationally. He reminded the participants that the sessions would help in the development of national policy issues. Lastly, General Griffin thanked everyone again and the workshop was adjourned.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT LOUISVILLE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge A		
Water table maintenance at older dams.		
1	Shoaling of rivers from locks and raising water level.	Affecting navigation.
Challenge B		
Healthy aquatic ecosystems – restoration and multiple purposes.		
2	Waterways are regarded as infrastructure/utility and are therefore neglected and abused with dumping, littering, overflows.	If public was more aware, valued the resource would reduce dumping and abuse of the waterway.
Challenge C		
Waterway users conflicts with commercial and recreation use.		
3	Waterways users conflict.	Commercial users and recreators.
4	Use of navigation channels by recreational craft.	Lack of knowledge of "Rules of Engagement" but recreational boaters- Impact on public safety and efficiency of commercial traffic.
Challenge D		
Adequate and dependable water supply.		
5	Water supply - Withdrawing from a river or stream or natural lake or aquifer must not imperil or impair water quality, aquatic and wildlife habitat or create a low flow that impacts water quality and/or aquatic and wildlife habitat.	A safe level must be maintained to protect these environmental values.
Challenge E		
Navigation– locks and dams are deteriorating and time to study and construct is unbearable.		
6	Maintenance of locks (40 years old) (O & M).	
Challenge F		
National aging infrastructure – smaller projects can not compete with larger ones – trust funds not sufficient.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge G		
Change in Corps mission statement to include water supply.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge H		
How to implement flood control projects – process that results in consensus.		
7	Flood control issues on secondary waterways.	Important due to damage to homes and property.
8	Flood prediction and warning on secondary waterways.	Important during unusual rain events – rapid even and little warning.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT LOUISVILLE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
9	Do we have an issue on the whole philosophy of reducing flood damage?	Does the Corp continue to install structural "solutions" or do we need to look at non structural flood damage reduction measures?
10	How to implement flood control project.	Incorporate transportation, water quality, recreation, environmental concerns, and reparation corridor.
Challenge I		
Funding for inland waterway projects – projects should be funded at full capability so that benefits are not lost.		
11	Lock and Dam improvement.	Projects need to be funded at full Corps of Engineers capability.
Challenge J		
Construction delays as a result of inadequate funding.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge K		
Failing infrastructure with no funds to replace any failed infrastructure.		
12	How to fund fixing our aging infrastructure. (pumps & gates)	Without population to promote congressional interest. Emergency response.
13	Aging infrastructure.	Lock and Dam facilities were built with certain life expectancy- for many the end is in sight.
14	Waterway infrastructure.	Projects system/nation wide should be funded at the rate of 270 to 300 m per year- budgeting authority. Not at 150-m level which has existed for past 7 years.
Challenge L		
Water quality enforcement – need overarching national and mission statement for the Corps.		
15	Runoff from roadways with regard to clean water act. Best management practices.	Important due to water quality as well as consequences of regulatory authority.
16	Water quality.	Silting, erosion, sedimentation, building development, human population waste, chemical/factory pollution.
17	More focused on navigation rather than water quality culture basis w/I Corps; (a) clean water act; (b) wetlands protection/restoration not important to the Corps.	Review and rewrite mission statement to include water quality. Corps should support a diversity of uses for water resources to include environmental concerns, industry, and recreation uses.
Challenge M		
Make sure that there is good coordination with all agencies and municipalities.		
	NO COMMENTS.	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT LOUISVILLE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge N		
Coordinated national policy on water issues that gives equal emphasis to environmental values.		
18	Water resources opportunities specific authority by congress.	Typically NA, FC, HYDRO, Regulatory. Limited water supply, wastewater, water quality, recreation.
Challenge O		
Process for smaller communities to accomplish smart growth.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge P		
Funding for flood control projects – need full funding and more flexibility for how local sponsors meet their share.		
19	Multi-agency/multi-jurisdictions; coordination for flood control; prep and response.	
Challenge Q		
Challenge 21.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge R		
Maintenance and protection of green spaces along the inland waterway to improve water quality.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge S		
Develop a recreational users education and licensing program regarding rules of the waterway.		
20	Instill self discipline respect for authority.	
Challenge T		
Lack of clear consistency for recreation and waterfront projects that results in inconsistencies between projects.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge U		
Lack of emergency response on waterways – do not have resources.		
21	Hazardous material spill/ cleanup issues with regard to the Clean Water Act. Best management practices.	Important due to: Fewer resources available on river.
22	Limited capabilities of regional oil spill resources or to handle oil spills	Don't have capability they say.
Challenge V		
Accuracy or inaccuracy of river stage reporting – problem for flood forecasting and levy operators.		
23	Keeping up with charting.	Universal, accuracy.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT LOUISVILLE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
24	Accuracy & maintenance to aids to navigation.	Corps annual updating may not reflect changes.
Challenge W		
Navigation approaches to dam are dangerous and time to get through locks are expensive (industry concern).		
25	Navigation mobilization.	
Challenge X		
Need for guidance and assistance for incorporating design features that are environmentally sensitive – process to gain local support for designs.		
26	Rapid development within watershed.	Need watershed or flood control management plan developed amongst communities.
Challenge Y		
Enhanced water based recreational opportunities; better access to Corps facilities; enhanced fishing opportunities.		
27		Increase importance of recreational activities such as fishing.
28	Wabash River dredging.	For barge traffic; keeping environment safe. Utilization of the Wabash for recreation purposes also.
Challenge Z		
Improved maintenance and stability schedule for navigation infrastructure.		
29	O & M Backlog.	The Corps and administration need to develop a program that addresses the backlog.
30	Retrieve abandoned sunken barges, wrecks.	Can be hit if not known about.
Challenge AA		
Catastrophic failure of navigation infrastructure.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge BB		
Development of Ohio River as an economic resource.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge CC		
Improvement of navigation infrastructure – coordinate with other federal agencies – develop a maritime navigation policy to assess demands on waterways by intermodal transportation and determine how to partner with other entities.		
31	Dredging to maintain navigation channel.	Corp to maintain 9# foot draft- Industry/ their customers have enjoyed as much as 12 feet most of the time – concern that we are slipping- dredging \$'s are not available- problem with placement of dredge spoils. (continue use/plan for dredge spoils)

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT LOUISVILLE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
32		To expedite the modernization of the lock and dam system on America's inland navigation system.
33	Kentucky River locks 1-4. What's going to be done with decaying infrastructure and deeper drafts.	Need bigger locks.
Challenge DD		
Recognition of contribution that waterborne commerce makes to minimizing environmental impacts.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge EE		
How to control sedimentation on rivers – to reestablish stream that are no longer navigable.		
34		Encourage Corps to look for beneficial user of dredge material.
35	Keep sediment out of waterways.	1) Watershed level BMP's to reduce sediment runoff & water velocities. 2) COE partner w/ other federal agencies & locals to foster BMP installation. a) Sediment removal costly & chronic. b) Sediment disposal is even bigger problem. 3) COE explore new ways to encourage or require watershed management principles & BMP as a part of waterway projects. 4) COE provide education & technology assistance to locals. 5) Implementation of BMP's must happen at local level However, direction can & must come from feds.
36	Erosion; loss of river bank.	Need to look at preventative measures (planning).
37	Using concrete; old debris for erosion.	Solution.
38	Navigation silting outside channel.	Need dredging; silting and out of channel dredging.
39	How to control sedimentation.	Reestablished streams to be navigable; how to remove (dredge) and promote prevention.
Challenge FF		
Predominance of commercial and industrial perspective in the permitting program which is in conflict with community and environmental values.		
40	Potential impacts on nav.of waterfront and development (municipal parks).	
41	Permitting process; needs common standards for historical society archeological finds.	Delays.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT LOUISVILLE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge GG		
Leadership at Corps – political support for budget.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge HH		
Water quality – wetlands protection and restoration and aquifer depletion groundwater contamination.		
42	Wildlife aquatic habitat.	Channelization; dam construction; wetlands destruction; pollution destroys it.
43	Protecting wetlands.	
44	Aquifer depletion and ground- water contamination.	Impacted by land- fills, acidic water from rain. Septic contamination from waste, pollution.
Challenge II		
Watershed habitat restoration process needs to be user friendly.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge JJ		
Economics cost benefits – includes fish and wildlife benefits and recreation benefits.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge KK		
Need to maintain navigation charts.		
45	Ability to maintain a timetable to move cargo on water.	
Challenge LL		
Post flood recovery assistance so that people can work through regulatory process.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge MM		
Assure that we can operate and maintain existing facilities before we build new ones.		
46	John T Meyers & Greenup	Lock & Dam should be authorized for extending the 600-foot lock to 1200 feet in next years WRDA. To take advantage of the window of opportunity.
47	The federal government needs to become a bigger partner in helping states, counties, and communities rebuild storm drainage and waste water/sewage systems.	
Challenge NN		
Industry get more politically active.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge OO		
Fundamental problem with publicity of what we do good and how money is saved.		
	NO COMMENTS.	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT LOUISVILLE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge PP		
Need for enforcement resources to support program.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge QQ		
Need for additional guidance and clarity on criteria – good explanation of jurisdiction.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge RR		
Development of information system for basin wide planning.		
48	Establish a river board; get different responses from Corps.	Need unified voice to get all the answers.
Challenge SS		
Fix loop hole in 404 permitting authorities.		
49	Permitting	Streamlining process with better guidelines.
Challenge TT		
How to achieve motivation in government to act to address water issues.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge UU		
Need for coordinated program on acquisition of high risk flood plain properties.		
50	I don't understand why this question didn't receive any more interest?	It would seem to me, if for example, <u>if the Corp bought the 100 year flood plain</u> . This would solve a lot of problems right?
Challenge VV		
Distribution and allocation of water resources among various sectors of economy.		
51	Integration of water supply conveyance into urban rehabilitation opportunities.	A)Brownfields B) Drainfields C) Straight – pipes-
Challenge WW		
The pollution of water resources and how to address source pollution and non-point pollution.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge XX		
Need to address policy, politics, and operations considerations and addressing any water resource issue.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge YY		
Corps to continue supporting clean water act – do not change definition of dredge fill to include mining.		
	NO COMMENTS.	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT LOUISVILLE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge ZZ		
Restore river and stream riparian corridors – focus on corridors and not watershed.		
52	Restoring rivers and streams.	Degradation of water quality and wildlife aquatic habitat, riparian corridors, flood plains encroached upon to reduce water quality, habitat, flood control for flood plains.
Challenge AAA		
Lack of development control		
	NO COMMENTS.	
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge BBB		
Response that 80% of all bacteria born disease is transmitted by water.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge CCC		
In this time of economic prosperity we are not spending money (local, state, federal) to repair, maintain, and improve infrastructure – if not now when?		
	NO COMMENTS.	

APPENDIX B

SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND MATERIALS

